REMARKS

1.   Applicant thanks the Examiner for his findings and observations. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his remarks regarding his understanding the substance of
5   Applicant's argument as stated in the last paragraph of Response to Argument, page 7.

2.   It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend the Claims solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner
10   consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In making such cancellations and amendments, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection to which Applicant considers the invention herein to be entitled. Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter
15   presented in this submission.

3.   **35 U.S.C. §102(a)**.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-13, 15-17, 20, and 21 rejected under 35 U.S. C. § 102(a) as being
20   anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,870,559 ("Leshem").

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

(a)   <u>Claim1</u>
25

Claim 1 appears below (emphasis added):

1.   (Previously amended) A method of presenting a search result comprising:
30   **determining categories for found information by analyzing the content of the information;**
      correlating the categories with images that represent the categories;
      and   displaying images that correspond to the categories;

2

wherein images corresponding to the found information are displayed when a user activates one of the categories.

The Examiner stated that Leshem teaches "A method of presenting a search result

5   comprising: determining categories for found information by analyzing the content of the information..." and cited (col. 18, lines 22-45).

(Col. 18, lines 22-45) appear below (emphasis added):

10   In a preferred implementation, the architecture includes five Astra plug-ins: Link Doctor, Action Tracker, Test World, Load Wizard and Search Meter. The functions performed by these plug-ins are summarized by Table 2. Other applications which will normally be installed on the client computer in conjunction with Astra include a standard Web browser (FIGS. 11 and 12),

15   and one or more editors (not shown) for editing URL content.

TABLE 2

PLUG-IN   FUNCTION PERFORMED

20

Link Doctor   Fixes broken links automatically
Action Tracker Retrieves and evaluates server log files to generate Web site activity data (such as activity levels on individual links), and
25   superimposes such data on site map in a user-adjustable manner.
Test World   Generates and drives tests automatically
Load Wizard   Utilizes site map to automatically
30   generate test scripts for the load testing of Web sites with Mercury Interactive's LoadRunner .TM. and SiteTest .TM. software packages.
Search Meter   Displays search engine results visually
35

3

Applicant is of the opinion that the cited passage herein above does not teach determining categories for found information by analyzing the content of the information.

5   Applicant does not understand what entities, in the cited passage hereinabove is the claimed invention's found information? It is evident from the preamble of Claim 1, that found information is from the search result. Is the Examiner implying that found information is "search engine results" from Search Meter hereinabove?

10   If not, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner clarify what the Examiner intends to anticipate found information.

If so, Applicant is of the opinion that the cited reference hereinabove does not teach determining categories for found information. Indeed, if the Examiner intends

15   "search engine results" to anticipate found information, then Applicant is of the opinion that the cited reference hereinabove does not teach determining categories for "search engine results". Determining categories for found information implies action with respect to "search engine results" and Applicant is of the opinion that the cited reference hereinabove only "displays" search engine results.

20

Again, if Applicant's rationale is not the Examiner's intent, then Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner clarify for Applicant which teaching of Leshem anticipates determining categories for found information.

25   Further, Applicant is of the opinion that the cited reference also does not teach determining categories for found information by analyzing the content of the information. Again, if the Examiner's intent that "search engine results" anticipates the claimed invention's found information, then Applicant sees no where in the cited reference where the content of the search engine results is analyzed.

30

Again, if Applicant's rationale is not the Examiner's intent, then Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner clarify for Applicant which teaching of Leshem anticipates

4

determining categories for found information by analyzing the content of the information.

Therefore, Applicant is of the opinion that Claim1 and claims dependent therefrom
5   are in condition for allowance. Simply put, the Claim 1 (and respective dependent Claims) is allowable because it meets the conditions for allowance set forth by the applicable Patent Laws, Patent Office Rules, and Case Law. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S. C. § 102(a).
10

(b)   Claims 11 and 12

Claims 11 and 12 are deemed to be in allowable condition for the same rationale as presented hereinabove for Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that
15   the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S. C. § 102(a).

(c)   Claim 13

Amended Claim 13 appears as follows:
20

13.   (Currently   amended)   A   method   of   presenting   information comprising[[;]]:
analyzing textual content of the information;
responsive to said analyzing textual content, generating a signature
25   based on said textual content;
associating the textual content with image content according to said signature; and
displaying the image content to illustrate the information[[.]]
wherein said signature identifies words, phrases, expressions, and
30   concepts that said image may be useful in representing.

Support can be found in the Specification on page 15, last paragraph through page 16, first paragraph.

5

Applicant is of the opinion that nowhere does Leshem teach <u>wherein said signature</u> <u>identifies words, phrases, expressions, and concepts that said image may be useful</u> <u>in representing</u>. As such, Applicant is of the opinion that Claim 13 and the respective

5   dependent Claims are in condition for allowance. According, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S. C. § 102(a).

     (d)   <u>Claims 20 and 21</u>

10   Claims 20 and 21 were amended in similar fashion as Claim 13. Therefore, for the same rationale as for Claim 13, Applicant is of the opinion that Claims 20 and 21 are in condition for allowance. According, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S. C. § 102(a).

15   4.   Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leshem in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,467,026 ("Yamamoto"). In view of the foregoing, there is no teaching or suggestion of the subject matter of Claim 9 in the references, either separately or in combination. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is deemed to be moot.

20

     5.   Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leshem in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,085,226 ("Yamamoto"). In view of the foregoing, there is no teaching or suggestion of the subject matter of Claim 14 in the references, either separately or in combination. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim

25   14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is deemed to be moot.

6

CONCLUSION

There being no outstanding issues remaining, the application is deemed to be in allowable condition. The Examiner is therefore earnestly requested to withdraw all

5 rejections, thus allowing the application to pass to issue as a United States Patent. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney/agent at (650) 474-8400.

10   Respectfully submitted,

                                      Julia A. Thomas
                                      Reg. No. 52,283
15
Customer No. 22862